



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,530	10/18/2001	Ross Faulkner Smith	60001.0097US01/MS172025.1	7764
27488	7590	10/23/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
P.O. BOX 2903				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/982,530	SMITH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David E. England	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/04/2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 – 8, 10, 11, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 – 8, 10, 11, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 8, 10, 11, 19 and 20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry (6961765) in view of Gruyer et al. (2002/0112048) (hereinafter Gruyer) in further view of Raveis, JR. (2001/0047282) (hereinafter Raveis).**

4. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry teaches a client-side system stored on a computer, wherein the client-side system logs, in a logging file, a plurality of user interactions performed in an application program module and periodically uploads the logging files to a remote server system for analysis of the logging file, wherein the client-side system comprises:

5. a logging code in communication with the application program module, wherein the logging code comprises a plurality of hooks into the application program module and an operating system of the computer, wherein when a user performs recordable action within an

application program, one of the plurality of hooks is triggered and a data record is generated, (e.g., col. 13, lines 30 – 52);

6. a logging file in communication with the logging code, wherein the logging code stores the data record in the logging file, (e.g., col. 13, lines 30 – 52 & col. 14, line 54 – col. 15, line 30);

7. a script file in communication with the logging file, wherein the script file is operative to upload the logging file to the remote server system, (e.g., col. 15, lines 18 – 65), but does not specifically teach wherein uploading the logging file to the remote server system comprises opening an Active Data Object (ADO) session with the remote server system and placing the logging file into an ADO database record set; and

8. a set-up program module, wherein launching the set-up program module signifies user consent to have application program actions logged.

9. Gruyer teaches a set-up program module, wherein launching the set-up program module signifies user consent to have application program actions logged, (e.g., ¶ 0040 – 0041). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gruyer with Terry because it enables a users the choice of whether or not they wish to be monitored by a network administrator. Furthermore, unlawfully loading of software that monitors users activities is an invasion of privacy and against the law, spyware.

10. Raveis teaches the remote server system comprises opening an Active Data Object (ADO) session with the remote server system and placing the logging file into an ADO database record set, (e.g., ¶ 0197 and 0226 – 0228). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Raveis with the combine inventions of

Terry and Gruyer because utilizing ADO database technology allows the system to communicate with multiple different types of databases which allows seamless integration and connection of different formatted databases.

11. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry teaches the script file uploads the logging file to the remote server system via an Internet connection, (e.g., col. 15, lines 18 – 65).

12. Referencing claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner Terry teaches the script file and logging code are generated by a set-up program module included with the application program module and stored on the computer, (e.g., col. 13, lines 30 – 52 & col. 14, line 54 – col. 15, line 30).

13. **Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry, Gruyer and Raveis as applied above, and in further view of Burgess et al. (5796633) (hereinafter Burgess).**

14. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry, Gruyer and Raveis do not specifically teach a scheduled event stored in the operating system and created in a predetermined time period, wherein, in response to the scheduled event being triggered, the script file uploads the logging file to the remote server system. Burgess teaches a scheduled

event stored in the operating system and created in a predetermined time period, wherein, in response to the scheduled event being triggered, the script file uploads the logging file to the remote server system, (e.g., col. 8, lines 19 – 63, “*Logging thread 50 logs performance data each predetermined time interval.* ”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Burgess with the combine system of Terry, Gruyer and Raveis because starting and ending specific events and labeling them with a time stamp in the operating system give the system the ability to maintain the newest information available and discard old information that isn’t of use to the system anymore.

15. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry teaches a computer-implemented method for tracking a plurality of user interactions performed in a software application program module stored on the user's computer, the method comprising the steps of:
 16. determining if any recordable user interaction performed in the software application program module has occurred, (e.g., col. 13, lines 30 – 52 & col. 14, line 54 – col. 15, line 30);
 17. recording the user interaction in a logging file on the computer, (e.g., col. 13, lines 30 – 52 & col. 14, line 54 – col. 15, line 30);
 18. determining whether the logging file exists, and, if so, then uploading the logging file to a remote analysis server, (e.g., col. 13, lines 30 – 52 & col. 14, line 54 – col. 15, line 30), but does not specifically teach allowing a user to determine if they wish to have interactions with the software application program module logged;
 19. opening an Active Data Object (ADO) session with the remote analysis server;
 20. placing the logging file into an ADO database record set;

21. determining that a scheduled event is triggered during a predetermined time period; and
22. wherein uploading the logging file comprises posting the ADO database record set to the remote analysis server.
23. Gruyer teaches allowing a user to determine if they wish to have interactions with the software application program module logged, (e.g., ¶ 0040 – 0041). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gruyer with Terry because of similar reasons stated above.
24. Burgess teaches determining that a scheduled event is triggered during a predetermined time period, (e.g., col. 8, lines 19 – 63, *“Logging thread 50 logs performance data each predetermined time interval.”*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Burgess with the combine system of Terry, Gruyer and Raveis because of similar reasons stated above.
25. Raveis teaches opening an Active Data Object (ADO) session with the remote analysis server, (e.g., ¶ 0197 and 0226 – 0228);
26. placing the logging file into an ADO database record set, (e.g., ¶ 0197 and 0226 – 0228);
27. wherein uploading the logging file comprises posting the ADO database record set to the remote analysis server, (e.g., ¶ 0197 and 0226 – 0228). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Raveis with the combine inventions of Terry, Gruyer and Burgess because of similar reasons stated above.
28. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry teaches each recorded user interaction comprises a time stamp, (e.g., col. 16, line 49 – col. 17, line 18),

29. a user identification, (e.g., col. 17, lines 33 – 65),
30. a UI element identifier, (e.g., col. 17, lines 33 – 65), and
31. a description of the method invoked to interact with the software application program module, (e.g., col. 17, lines 33 – 65).

32. As per claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry does not specifically teach the remote analysis server is a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server. Gruyer teaches the remote analysis server is a Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) server, (e.g., ¶ 0065). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Gruyer with Terry because utilizing an HTTP server, (web server), give the system the ability to communicate with users from different networks on the web.

33. As per claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry teaches a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions, which when executed, are operable to perform the steps of claim 10, (e.g., col. 16, line 49 – col. 17, line 18).

34. Referencing claim 19, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry teaches each recorded user interaction further comprises at least one of the following;
35. an application source, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30);
36. verbal dialog invoked, (e.g., Abstract & col. 12, line 47 – col. 13, line 16);
37. button pressed, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30);
38. menu used, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30);

39. menu item selected, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30);
40. application launch, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30);
41. application termination, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30);
42. operating system used, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30); and
43. screen resolution.

44. Referencing claim 20, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry teaches the description of the method invoked to interact with the software application program module comprises at least one of keyboard or mouse, (e.g., col. 8, lines 14 – 30).

45. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry, Gruyer, Raveis and Burgess in further view of Jawahar et al. (6256620), (hereinafter Jawahar).

46. As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Terry, Gruyer, Raveis and Burgess do not specifically teach the step of deleting the logging file on the computer after it has been uploaded. Jawahar teaches the step of deleting the logging file on the computer after it has been uploaded, (e.g., col. 15, lines 17 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Jawahar with the combine system of Terry, Gruyer, Raveis and Burgess because deleting the logging file after sending it to a server would free up more memory at the users terminal for additional logging data to be stored and transferred.

47. **Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry, Gruyer, Raveis, Burgess and Jawahar as applied to claims 5 – 7 above, and in view of Ploetz et al. (6738798), (hereinafter Ploetz).**

48. As per claim 8, as closely as interpreted by the Examiner, Terry, Gruyer, Burgess and Jawahar do not specifically teach the step of renaming the logging file with a random number before uploading the logging file to the remote analysis server. Ploetz teaches the step of renaming the logging file with a random number before uploading the logging file to the remote analysis server, (e.g., col. 7, lines 45 – 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Ploetz with the combine system of Terry, Gruyer, Burgess and Jawahar because renaming a file with a random number could prevent a system from naming a file with the same name.

Response to Arguments

49. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 8, 10, 11, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based on amended material that was not previously stated in the independent claims.

Conclusion

50. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

DE *DE*



DAVID E. ENGLAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100